



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,564	09/26/2005	Akira Amano	63907(71526)	8349
21874	7590	09/03/2008	EXAMINER	
EDWARDS ANELI, PALMER & DODGE LLP			LAO, MARIALOUISA	
P.O. BOX 55874			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02205			1621	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/550,564	AMANO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Louisa Lao	1621	

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 17 July 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-7

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: see continuation sheet.

/Porfirio Nazario-Gonzalez/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1621

Applicants' arguments filed in the reply mailed 7/17/08 focuses on claim 1 of the cited prior art reference US5756838, US'838 and summarily compares instant claim 1 with claim 1 of US'838; whereupon Applicants reiterate their arguments of "optical purity".

However, Applicants may have misread the Office Action mailed 4/17/08 as to the art rejection set forth for the reasons stated therein. The disclosures of US'838 were stated in the Office Action, which did not focus on or mention claim 1 of said cited reference. Applicants are correct that a point-to-point comparison of instant claim 1 and claim 1 of said cited reference would show differences - BUT those were not the points set forth as differences between the cited reference and the instant claims.

Applicants adamantly allege that the combination of the teachings of the cited art references would not render obvious the instant claims, with the argument that "optical purity" can not be had as instantly claimed, and that an artisan would have to do various experimentations to reach the instant process.

However, Applicants fail to provide a showing of criticality and unexpected beneficial results that an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention would have found obvious using routines of experimentation to CONCEIVABLY infer and arrive at the combination of the teachings of the cited art references that render the instant claims obvious.

Applicants argue that US'838, by itself, has different method steps and would not arrive at the instant optical purity.

However, Applicants have failed to show any comparative showing against the teachings of the cited art references to support this argument.

Applicants' arguments are unpersuasive; thus, the rejection is maintained.

Further, new claim 7 embodies the limitations of independent claim 1 and claims thereto; as well as those of independent claim 5 and dependent claims thereto. The rejection set forth in the Office Action mailed 4/17/08 encompass also claim 7 for reasons set forth then, and as above.

No claims are allowed.